party at the ensuing general election regardless of the party affiliation of voters who voted for that candidate.

In Washington, unlike California, a candidate for a partisan office need not first pass muster with a political party to which he chooses to align; the candidates simply self-declare their affiliation. Voters are not required to declare openly affiliation with one party or another in order to vote. This system is like the nonpartisan blanket primary described by the majority in *California Democratic Party*, except that rather than the top two (or other number) of vote getters moving on to the general election, Washington election laws allow those candidates receiving at least 1% of the total votes cast for all candidates for that position and a plurality of the votes cast for the candidates of his or her party for that office to advance to the general election ballot.

Two provisions of thc Washington Constitution are relevant to the overall circumstances: (1) All qualified voters are entitled to vote at all elections. Wash. Const. Art. VI, § 1. (2) "All elections shall be by ballot. The Legislature shall provide for such method of voting as will secure to every elector absolute secrecy in preparing and deposing his ballot." Wash. Const. Art. VI, § 6.

The Grange Intervenors provided some historical information. Importantly, and distinct from California, Washington has never required voters to register by political party. The Washington Legislature passed a law in 1922 that would have required all voters to register by political party, but a constitutional referendum was immediately filed, and Referendum Measure 14 (1922) overwhelmingly – 2.5:1 against – rejected the law providing for party registration. The Washington Legislature also tried to adopt a system of "party primaries," including a loyalty oath requirement and giving political parties access to a list of voters participating in their primary. Again, a referendum petition was filed, and at the ensuing election, Referendum 15 (1922) was adopted and the "party primary" and list law was rejected by more than 2.5:1.

In 1933, the Grange, with support from other associations, circulated for voter signatures and qualified the "blanket primary" initiative. In 1934, the Legislature voted to enact the initiative

and adopted the blanket primary system. (Washington's Initiative No. 2 and 1935 Wash. Law. Ch. 26) The Washington blanket primary statute having been enacted by the State Legislature, does not suffer from the same infirmity – being enacted by popular initiative alone – that concerned the dissent in *California Democratic Party*, 530 U.S. at 602-03.

Since the Washington Legislature adopted the blanket primary, there have been legal challenges to the system and a jurisprudential history has developed that further elucidates the background circumstances in Washington. *Anderson v. Millikin*, 186 Wash. 602, 59 P.2d 295 (1936) upheld the constitutionality of Washington's blanket primary. *Anderson* held that as to the general objection that the law tends to destroy political parties, there is no concern of political parties in the constitution; the people in adopting both the state and federal constitutions went no further than to protect the elector in his right to cast a ballot; not a coerced party ballot, but for the candidate of his choice, whether he be upon one ballot or another. "Finding no guaranty, express or implied, in favor of either a candidate or a party in the constitution, it follows that he or his party *can claim no greater rights than the voter himself. The fountain cannot rise higher than its source.*" 186 Wash. at 606. The *Anderson* court also addressed an associational rights issue with an interesting point of view. The Court said that as to the argument that without the party test, those voters so inclined may elect Democrats as Republican precinct committeemen and vice versa,

> ...[i]t is not to be presumed that any voter will abandon his right to participate in the selection of the committeeman of his own party in order to foist an unwanted individual upon a party to which he is opposed. But whether so or not, the provisions now under consideration apply equally to all parties who may be affected thereby, and thus there is no discrimination in favor of or against any.

Id. at 607-08.

Next, there was *Heavey v. Chapman*, 93 Wn.2d 700, 611 P.2d 1256 (1980), which presented the question of whether the blanket primary (RCW 29.18.100 and those statutes implementing it RCW 29.30.010, .030) unconstitutionally restrict the plaintiffs' right of association under the state and federal constitutions. A unanimous Washington State Supreme Court held that they do not.

The *Heavey* Court asked whether the Plaintiffs (a political party and two of its members) have shown a substantial burden and answered:

> Not only have they not shown a substantial burden, but they concede they cannot do so. Plaintiffs seek to avoid establishing a substantial burden by asserting the court places a "burden of negative proof" on them to which they cannot respond because voter ballots are made secret by another separate state action, the secret ballot. Plaintiffs suggest we abandon the substantial burden test and instead adopt what they term the "modified review standard."

93 Wn.2d at 702-03. The Court declined to adopt the modified review standard and said that "we believe the failure of plaintiffs even to attempt to show a substantial burden to their right of association is dispositive of the case." *Id.* at 703. The Court stated: "... at the very least those who would overturn statutes on constitutional grounds should offer some evidence they have been harmed. Mere assertions of injury do not make for the violation of constitutional rights." Finally, the Court held that even though the case failed for failure to demonstrate a substantial burden to their associational rights, there were certain compelling state interests that support a blanket primary: allowing each voter to keep party identification secret; allowing the broadest possible participation in the primary election; and giving each voter a free choice among all candidates in the primary. The Court saw the purpose of the statute stated in RCW 29.18.200 to allow:

> All properly registered voters [to] vote for their choice at any primary election, for any candidate for each office regardless of political affiliation and without a declaration of political faith or adherence on the part of the voter.

Id. at 705. This purpose contrasts sharply with that of California's Proposition 198, which was, the Supreme Court observed: "Promoted largely as a measure that would 'weaken' party 'hard-liners' and ease the way for 'moderate problem-solvers'." *California Democratic Party*, 530 U.S. at 570. The Court concluded that the correction of any defects should be left to the legislature or popular initiative. *Id.*

The question is, under these circumstances, does Washington's primary system impermissibly burden the associational rights of the political parties.

C. EVIDENCE ON ISSUE OF BURDEN ON RIGHT OF ASSOCIATION

The political parties must demonstrate to the Court that Washington's primary election laws place a substantial burden upon their First Amendment right of association. *See American Party v. White*, 415 U.S. 767 (1974); *Kadrmas v. Dickinson Pub. Sch.*, 487 U.S. 450 (1988). Whether a burden on a party's associational rights is substantial is a question of law. *See Eu v. San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee*, 489 U.S. 214, 109 S. Ct. 1013, 1018-21 (1989).

The Democratic Party describes its view of the burden placed on political parties by Washington's blanket primary: it claims that the system forces the Party to adulterate its candidate selection process, to have its message changed, and potentially to have the outcome of its primaries altered, and that this burden is the heaviest imaginable. This is, essentially, the burden described by the Republican Party, as well. The Libertarian Party sees the same burdens upon it now that it has moved from minor party to major party status, but sees these burdens as rendering even greater dangers because the Party is yet small.

Through various witnesses, the political parties assert evidence of a substantial burden on their associational rights. The State and the Grange submit evidence on their behalf as well. Some of the expert testimony submitted is the subject of motions to strike on a variety of bases.

1. Expert Testimony–
Michael Snyder, Todd Donovan, Ph.D. and David J. Olson, Ph.D.

In support of their contentions of a substantial burden on their associational rights, the Democratic and Republican Parties rely on testimony of Michael Snyder, whom they present as their expert, as well as the testimony of other individuals.

The State and the Grange rely on the testimony of Professor Todd Donovan and Professor David J. Olson.

The State and the Grange challenge the testimony of Michael Snyder on two bases: (1) he lacks the professional qualifications to give expert testimony, and (2) his report fails to satisfy at

least two parts of the three-part test set forth in Fed. R. Evid. 702 for expert witnesses. Each of these challenges will be discussed in turn.

a. The Experts' Qualifications

Mr. Snyder summarized his education and professional experience in his curriculum vitae. He has a Bachelor of Arts in history and did some post-graduate study of Eastern European history, but did not receive a post-graduate degree. (Snyder Dep. p. 6) He testified at his deposition that he sat in on some political science classes, although he doesn't have any direct recollection of it. (*Id.* p. 7) He stated that he took one class in statistics. (*Id.* p. 6) His work experience includes work on two political campaigns for two different candidates in the Midwest and for the Washington State Democratic Campaign and Caucus as a "Phone Bank Director" involving volunteer callers in one case and paid callers in another wherein he wrote "scripts," trained the callers, did polling, and "voter i.d." He describes his work for the Washington Democratic Campaign and Caucus in September 1990 to April 1991 as involving legislative analysis and constituent relations. He also worked for a Washington consulting company with clients nationwide, where he did a variety of things including copy writing, speech writing, and "targeting," that is, analyzing election data, voter registration, election results. He is currently an independent consultant in Washington doing strategic planning and election analysis, research, and writing.

Defendant Secretary of State Reed and the Grange argue that Mr. Snyder does not have the requisite professional qualifications to give expert testimony; that Michael Snyder may have experience as a campaign consultant, but that he does not have the broad analytical background he would need to express opinions on such a broad topic as the effect of the blanket primary on political parties.

It is true that Michael Snyder lacks training in political science or in statistics, relevant study areas to address the issues in this case. Short of concluding that Mr. Snyder is unqualified as an

expert in this case, the best that can be said is that he lacks the experience, the educational stature, and credentials to be authoritative in his opinions.

In contrast, Todd Donovan, Ph.D. (hereafter Dr. or Professor Donovan), is a professor of political science at Western Washington University, and his teaching areas are American politics, state and local politics; parties, campaigns and elections; comparative electoral systems; research methods and statistics (introductory level). His research areas are electoral systems and representation, political behavior, sub-national politics, direct democracy, political economy of local development. He is widely published, with books, book chapters, edited volumes, and articles in academic journals to his credit. Dr. Donovan's credentials render him an authoritative expert in this case. While the Democratic Party argues that Dr. Donovan's report ought to be excluded because it was late, nevertheless, the delay did not cause harm to the political parties who were able to take his deposition on November 7 and they questioned him about all aspects of his report. Dr. Donovan is qualified as an expert and his report will not be excluded.

David J. Olson, Ph.D.(hereafter Dr. or Professor Olson) is presently a Professor in the Political Science Department at the University of Washington. As reflected in his Curriculum Vitae, he has a large number of books and articles to his credit, he reviews manuscripts for a variety of journals and agencies, he regularly gives speeches, and he has been active as a consultant since 1980. Dr. Olson is certainly qualified as an expert to testify on the matters at issue in this case.

b. Expert Opinion – Federal Evidence Rule 702

Secretary of State Reed and the Grange contend that Mr. Snyder's report fails most of the five factors of the test from *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993)(one of three cases that prompted the revision of Fed. R. Evid. 702 into its present form); they also contend that Mr. Snyder's report fails at least two parts of the three-part test of Fed. R. Evid. 702. Federal Evidence Rule 702 provides:

> If scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise, if (1) the testimony is based upon sufficient facts or data, (2) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods, and (3) the witness has applied the principles and methods reliably to the facts of the case.

Daubert set forth a list of non-exclusive factors to be considered in evaluating scientific expert testimony: (1) whether the expert's technique or theory can be or has been tested; (2) whether the technique or theory has been subject to peer review or publication; (3) the known or potential rate of error of the theory or technique when applied; (4) the existence and maintenance of standards and controls; and (5) whether the technique or method has been generally accepted in the scientific community. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 593-94. *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137, 147 (1999) clarified *Daubert* to include in the Court's "gatekeeper" role the screening of all proposed experts and their work, not just those advancing scientific opinions. In *General Electric Co. v. Joiner*, 522 U.S. 136, 146-47 (1997), the Court confirmed that challenges to the admissibility of expert opinions do not present issues of fact that would preclude summary judgment. The Court stated:

> Trained experts commonly extrapolate from existing data. But nothing in either *Daubert* or the Federal Rules of Evidence requires a district court to admit opinion evidence that is connected to existing data only by the *ipse dixit* of the expert. A court may conclude that there is simply too great an analytical gap between the data and the opinion proffered.

General Electric, at 146, 118 S. Ct. 512, 519.

The political parties asked Mr. Snyder to determine "To what extent did nonmembers of the Democratic Party participate in contested Washington primaries in September 2000? To what extent did nonmembers of the Republican Party participate in contested Republican primaries in December 2000?" (Snyder Dep. pp. 18 and 19) The political parties gave Mr. Snyder a definition of what constituted party membership: "Members of the Democratic Party are defined as registered voters who participated in the February 2000 Washington presidential preference primary, and were

issued a Democratic ballot," and they described members of the Republican Party similarly, referring to the February 2000 presidential preference primary. (Snyder Dep. at 19) Voters who were issued an unaffiliated ballot at the preference primary were not considered to be members of either the Democratic or Republican party. *Id.*

In the Plaintiffs' disclosures of expert testimony, Mr. Snyder's testimony is summarized: By comparing the ballot issuance records between the February 2000 presidential preference primary to the total votes recorded in a party's September 2000 primary, it is possible to determine whether more voters were allowed to participate in the party's primary than were known to be supporters of the party. In Mr. Snyder's "Preliminary Report Washington 2000 Blanket Primary Vote Analysis," he concludes that non-party voters – those who did not cast that party's preference ballot in the 2000 presidential primary – participated in the 2000 Democratic and Republican blanket primary nominations process, often, at all levels of government, and in some cases, such participation was decisive. *Id.* at 16. Further, Mr. Snyder concluded that Democrats and Republicans participated in each other's primary. *Id.*

Mr. Snyder's evidence does not pass the first and second tests of Fed. R. Evid. 702. Mr. Snyder did not make a determination of party membership based on an analysis of relevant data; he merely accepted a definition from the political parties. Then, he reached his conclusions by simply performing mathematical computations. Dr. Donovan pointed to two key flaws in Mr. Snyder's analysis: (1) he used an untenable definition of "member" of the Democratic and Republican Parties by assuming that the only voters who can be regarded as members of the parties are those voters who participated in the February 2000 Washington presidential preference primary and were issued ballots affiliated with those parties; and (2) he used data from the February 2000 presidential preference primary to make estimates of "non-party members" voting in the September 2000 state primary election. Dr. Olson's Statement discussed the issue of political party membership:

> In Washington, voters are not required to indicate party affiliation, adherence to a political party, or even party preference when registering to vote. As a matter of state statutory law, there is no legal basis for determining party membership in Washington State. And, under Washington's blanket primary system, which opens participation in selecting nominees for partisan offices to all registered voters, regardless of party preference, adherence or affiliation, there is no legal or organizational basis for determining party membership.
>
> In the absence of legal requirements to declare party affiliation when registering to vote, or requirements for paying dues to a party, or formally joining a party by signature, or making a public declaration of party adherence, there is no easy or clear way to define membership in political parties in Washington State. Instead, party affiliation in Washington is a psychological state of either identifying or not identifying with one or another of the major or minor political parties.

Statement of David J. Olson, Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, p. 4.

The Republican Party protests the idea that the definition of a political party should be left to a political scientist rather than to the political party itself. Similarly, the Democratic Party argues that

> [t]he State's preference that the Democratic Party organize itself in some other fashion or use some other eligibility requirement is not a basis for disregarding Mr. Snyder's testimony. The determination of how to structure the Party and who is eligible to participate in the Party's candidate selection process belongs to the Party, not the State or its academic experts.

Dem. Party Opp. Memo. at 18. This argument ignores the inherent problem with the political parties' definition of party membership in Washington.

In his declaration, Professor Donovan explained that the 2000 presidential preference primary presented a very biased picture of how voters are affiliated with parties in Washington. (Donovan Decl. at 4-6) For example, and among other things, the primary was weakly contested, as Vice President Gore had already locked up the Democratic nomination before the Washington primary, so there was little incentive for Democrats to turn out. Thus, there would be a substantial under-estimate of the proportion of voters affiliated with the Democrats, and a biased estimate of Republican affiliates would also be produced. *Id.* Professor Donovan also goes on to state that the definition used in the Snyder report would never pass peer review in an academic journal, and that he knew of no study that has ever used this method. (Donovan Decl. ¶ 16) In his deposition,

Professor Donovan testified that his definitions of party affiliation are used commonly in academic journals. (Donovan Dep. at 134; and see Prof. Donovan's "Report on the Consequences of Washington's Blanket Primary" at 1).

Besides using a nonstandard definition of party membership, Professor Donovan cited Mr. Snyder's use of noncomparable data – that is, that something that happened in February would be a measure of the partisan affiliations of voters in September – as another aspect of his report that would not pass peer review. (Donovan Dep. at 135) Professor Donovan was asked whether what Mr. Snyder did wasn't the same as what happened in California – where "they simply counted the votes and analyzed the data based on the registration that was shown on the ballot?" (*Id.* at 210) Dr. Donovan explained that "the act of registering, I would assume, is not biased by a particular election in a particular year, whereas the way that Snyder has done his, who is likely to sign in as a Democrat or Republican in that example is biased by that particular election context." (*Id.* at 211)

Before one can gauge the impact of a primary election system upon a party's associational rights, one must identify political party members. This identification was easily done in California where voters must register their party affiliation, but the same is not true in Washington. The problem of identifying party members in Washington precludes a determination that those outside the party dilute the votes of those within the party. Professor Olson was questioned on this point in his deposition, and his answer highlights the problem:

> Q. Am I correct that you're unable to tell me whether, in this state, the vote of members of the Democratic Party in the Selection of their nominees – you're unable to tell me whether that vote is diluted by the presence or potential presence of independents and Republicans in that process?
>
> A. And the vote that's being diluted is the party members?
>
> Q. Yes.
>
> A. I don't know what "party members" means in the context of this question.

Olson Dep. at 45.

Mr. Snyder's Report is not based upon sufficient facts or data, and the testimony is not the product of reliable principles and methods. Mr. Snyder's mathematical calculations may be correct,